



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,916	10/29/2003	John Gerard Speare	13768-449	9720

47973 7590 06/03/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/697,916	Applicant(s) SPEARE ET AL.	
	Examiner Carl Colin	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>see att</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 3/10/2005, applicant amends claims 1, 14, 15, 28, 29, 36, 37, and 44. The following claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

1.1 In response to communications filed on 3/10/2005, the objection to claims 14, 28, 36, and 44 have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

2. Applicant's arguments, pages 12-15, filed on 3/10/2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-44 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's assumption that Examiner "seemed to concur with the analysis presented in the reply...", no agreement was reached in the interview. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. Applicant further limits the claimed invention by amending the claims. Upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.1 **Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-19, 21-22, 25-31, 34-40, and 43-44,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,204,897 to **Wyman** in view of US patent 6,189,146 to **Misra et al.**

3.2 **As per claims 1, 12, 15, 26, 29, 35, 37, and 43, Wyman** discloses in a messaging system comprising a rights management server that controls the type of operations principals can perform on protected content and a message server that receives messages and makes them available to principals or their agents, a method of pre-licensing content subject to rights management in order to allow a principal access to the content when the principal does not have access to the rights management server, the method comprising acts of: a license server that meets the recitation of message server, receiving a license document or license use authorization by an issuer that meets the recitation of right management server and the license document allows one or more principal to access that meets the recitation of receiving, by the message server, a message which is subject to rights management in that access to at least a part of the message is controlled through a rights management server the rights management server issuing

Art Unit: 2136

one or more user licenses that allow one or more principals to access the at least part of the message subject to rights management, for example (see abstract and column 8, lines 11-10-15); receiving, by the message server on behalf of the one or more principals, the at least one use license so that the one or more principals may obtain the at least one use license from the message server and access the at least part of the message subject to rights management without having to request the at least one use license from the rights management server (column 7, lines 30 through column 8, line 5). **Wyman** discloses use of a management server but suggests using other servers to delegate request, which includes information from the server database (column 7, lines 30 through column 8, line 5). **Wyman** is silent about a publishing license “received by the license server” because the management server stores publishing license information. **Misra** in an analogous art, discloses an intermediate server receiving a publishing license on behalf of a principal, the request containing rights expression such as client ID in one embodiment and other information in different embodiment (column 15, lines 1-15 and column 16, lines 23-55 and column 17, lines 13-25 column 13, lines 12-42) for use in authenticating the request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Wyman** to have the server received a publishing license containing a rights expression specifying one or more intended recipients for the at least part of the message subject to rights management and one or more rights for each of the one or more intended recipients for use in identifying the at least part of the message subject to rights management to the rights management server because if the server is not trusted it would not be appropriate to store license key information to maliciously modify the license as the license is encrypted using the client key as taught by **Misra** (see column 15, lines 35-50). This modification would have

Art Unit: 2136

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it allows the client to request and obtain license from the license server or the issuer and establish a trusted communications without the need to trust the intermediate server as suggested by **Misra** (see column 15, lines 35-50).

As per claims 2, 16, and 38, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses the limitation of wherein the at least a part of the message controlled through the rights management server is encrypted, and wherein the use license comprises a content key used in decrypting the part of the message that is encrypted, for example (see **Misra**, column 11, table 5). Therefore these claims are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claims 3 and 17, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses the limitation of wherein the part of the message that is encrypted is at least one of a protected contact, protected document, protected calendar item or protected meeting request, for example (see **Wyman**, abstract). Therefore these claims are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claims 4, 18, and 39, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses wherein the act of requesting at least one use license further includes sending an authentication to the rights management server to verify that the message server has the authority to obtain the at least one use license on behalf of the one or more principals, for example (see **Misra**, column 6, lines 30-65). Therefore these claims are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claims 5, 14, 19, 28, 36, 40 and 44, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses to have the message server requests multiple use licenses on behalf of the one or more principals so that the one or more principals may access the message on multiple machines (Wyman, column 7, lines 30 through column 8, line 22 and Misra, column 4, lines 30-58).

As per claims 7, 21, and 30, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses the limitation of wherein the publishing license includes a reference to the one or more principals such that when the message server requests the at least one use license, the rights management server may validate that the one or more principals are intended to have access to the message, for example (see Misra, column 6, lines 30-65). Therefore these claims are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claims 8, 22, and 31, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses the limitation of wherein the publishing license further includes at least one rights expression that limits the types of operations the one or more principals are allowed to perform on the message, for example (see Misra column 7, lines 1-12 and Wyman, column 12, lines 15-25 and column 32, lines 39-67).

As per claims 11, 25, and 34, the combination of **Wyman and Misra** discloses the limitation of wherein the rights expression includes an expiration feature, which limits at least one of the number of times or a time period the at least one rights expression is available, for

Art Unit: 2136

example (see Misra column 7, lines 1-12 and Wyman, column 12, lines 15-25 and column 32, lines 39-67).

As per claims 13 and 27, Wyman discloses the limitation of wherein the publishing license further comprises one or more of a hash used to verify the message has not changed and a signing by the rights management server used to verify that the publishing license is valid, for example (see Misra table 1).

4. **Claims 6, 9-10, 20, 23-24, 32-33, and 41-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,204,897 to **Wyman** in view of US patent 6,189,146 to **Misra et al** as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of US Patent 6,820,063 to **England et al**.

4.1 **As per claims 6, 9-10, 20, 23-24, 32-33, and 41-42**, both references substantially teach the claimed method of claim 1. Neither of the references explicitly discloses storing the use license separate from the message. **England et al** in an analogous art teaches restriction of use license and also teaches right to access or copy, store a content or a particular file wherein the at least one use license is stored by the server separate from the message in order to add security and control access to the storage of keys, for example (see column 19, lines 55-61 and column 17, lines 2-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as combined above to have at least one use license stored by the server separate from the message because the separation adds security and control access to the storage of keys as suggested by **England et al**. This modification would

Art Unit: 2136

have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **England et al** so as to add security and control access to the storage of keys.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

5.1 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as the art discloses limited access to content where one or more principals does not need to request the use license from the server. Many of the claimed features are disclosed in these disclosures.

US Patents: 6,643,774 McGarvey 6,205,480 Broadhurst et al
6,385,728 DeBry; 6,487,599 Smith et al; 5,742,759 Nessett et al.

Art Unit: 2136

5.2 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 571-272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ce

Carl Colin
Patent Examiner
May 30, 2005


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100